Ham-Policy Digest   Tue, 31 Aug 93   Volume 93 : Issue 314

Today's Topics:
                         4X1RU REJECT LIST
        I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah (3 msgs)
                     MARS ops who are not hams?
Pro-code != anti-no-code (Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah)
                         Updating the test

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

In article <cewy9B5w165w@nj8j.atl.ga.us> ben@nj8j.atl.ga.us (Ben Coleman) writes:
>But this does raise a question - how do the new FCC rules apply where the
>originator and first relay are not under FCC jurisdiction? Do 'illegal
>content' messages that originate outside the U.S. get a 'free ride'
>through the U.S. packet system? Or(more likely) is the 'first relay'
>*under FCC jurisdiction* held responsible? The latter would seem to
>militate against PBBSs with international links relaying messages which
>are in a language not understood by the sysop.
>
Perhaps they ought to adopt the approach of the UK authorities....

The rules here basically state that a sysop is not responsible for the

contents of a message which he has not reviewed. It does go on to say that
a sysop ought to review the contents of his BBS reasonably often, but if
a message arrives after I have gone to bed and departs before I get up in
the morning then I can't be held responsible for it. Also, because the
number of messages passing through is so large, I can't reasonably review
all of them, so I am not responsible for those I haven't looked at.

On a related note, perhaps the mechanism of forwarding mail needs to be
changed, so a personal message doesn't get lost when it bumps into a reject
file. It should either get held at the previous BBS with a tag to show it
was rejected or at the very least an automatic message to the sender to say
that his message was rejected at XXX BBS. Perhaps that would make sysops use
the facility a bit less indiscriminately.

Dave

```
********************************************************************************
* G4WRW @ GB7WRW.#41.GBR.EU AX25    *    Start at the beginning. Go on    *
* dave@llondel.demon.co.uk  Internet *     until the end. Then stop.       *
* g4wrw@g4wrw.ampr.org      Amprnet  *     (the king to the white rabbit)  *
********************************************************************************
```

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 93 22:33:09 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!swrinde!
menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

> [...]
> But their arguements contain a major flaw: there are no problems in the
> CW subbands; there is no intentional interference, no profanity, no
> false MAYDAY calls, no one being arrested or fined or having their
> license yanked. Any and all problems are on the voice segments.
>
> The CW operators are true gentlemen. I dare any of you to listen to
> the CW segments and prove me wrong (of course, that will take a knowledge
> of code...)
>
> In the 25 years that I have been reading QST I don't recall the FCC ever
> taking action against a ham operating CW. Never.
>
> Jeff NH6IL

I second the motion.

```
  --Robert

------------------------------

Date: Sun, 29 Aug 93 21:03:44 CDT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!howland.reston.ans.net!math.ohio-state.edu!
cs.utexas.edu!swrinde!menudo.uh.edu!jpunix!unkaphaed!amanda!
robert@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

mgustoff@mstcsh.uucp (My Box) writes:

> ============================================================================
> !I think the point really is that the 13-20 WPM as a REQUIREMENT for HF
> !work is a silly and does not seem to fit in the "real" world. I have had
> !my ticket since Feb. and am proud to say NO, I will not learn the code past
> !5 WPM. But I still want HF access, I should not be shut out. But thats not
> !to say that I feel it should be elimated, only as a requirment.
> !
> ============================================================================
>

I think this pretty well sums up the current "no-code" attitude.
Why is it that a significant minority of Americans are afraid of
putting forth effort, and think that everything should be handed
to them of a silver platter? Dana, are you listening?

  --Robert

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 1993 22:16:57 GMT
From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <y2s39B5w165w@amanda.jpunix.com> robert,
robert@amanda.jpunix.com writes:
>I second the motion.


I third the motion.  How about a vote?

------------------------------

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 1993 22:07:03 GMT
```

From: spsgate!mogate!newsgate!nuntius@uunet.uu.net
Subject: MARS ops who are not hams?
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <CCJ6EM.B71@world.std.com> Daniel T Senie, dts@world.std.com
writes:
>It is not necessary or practical to encompass every aspect of amateur
radio
>in detail on examinations. What makes more sense is to incorporate such
>material in ham radio classes and books

I think this a very sensible approach to the issue. I know many people
who don't have any desire to participate in Emergency communications. I
feel the same about CW...This is a hobby not a mandatory life style.
Instead of giving politicians the keys to the city, Maybe we should
                                    change the locks!
Rick Aldom   ex STS1/SS**The opinions expressed are my
Sub Sailors do it deeper**own and probably aren't yours!

Date: 30 Aug 93 21:30:22 GMT
From: att-out!cbnewsj!k2ph@RUTGERS.EDU
Subject: Pro-code != anti-no-code (Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I hate to be a nit-picker, but a previous posting equated pro-code
with anti-no-code. They are NOT the same thing. I am pro-code
(in fact, CW and packet are just about all I use), but I'm not
anti-no-code. I, too, fail to see the relevency of a Morse Code
test as a licensing REQUIREMENT in 1993.

A small thing, sir, but mine own.

Asbestos underwear now on. :-)

73,
Bob K2PH

--

Bob Schreibmaier K2PH | UUCP: ...!att!mtdcr!bob
AT&T Bell Laboratories | Internet: bob@mtdcr.att.com
Middletown, N.J. 07748 | ICBM: 40o21'N, 74o8'W

Date: 30 Aug 93 20:34:43 GMT

From: ogicse!uwm.edu!math.ohio-state.edu!sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!
jms@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Updating the test
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Perry Scott (perry@fc.hp.com) wrote:
: keith@unm.edu wrote:
: : *** Warning *** This is more of the endless code argument, so if you're
: : completely fed up with it, hit n now.

*** bunch of stuff deleted ***

: 5. VEC integrity. The CW test is graded by 3 VEs. The proposal must
:   be gradeable by 3 VEs OF's that may not know what they are grading.
                            ^^^^
*** more stuff deleted ***

: Perry Scott
: AA0ET
: (ARRL VE)

Why do many people that post replies feel the need to 'slam' other folks?
I find the term 'OF' offensive and I'm not sure if I fit into the mold
or not. (52 years old, first licensed in 1959, keep up with the new
technology, etc). There are many YFs that don't know what they are doing
as well. (There, I did it too). With the new grading templates for the
written tests, almost anyone could grade the tests, so it doesn't seem
that one needs to know much to grade tests.

Mike Stansberry
K0TER
(ARRL VE)

Date: Mon, 30 Aug 1993 12:39:52 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!agate!doc.ic.ac.uk!uknet!bnr.co.uk!bnrgate!nmerh207!corpgate!
nrtpa038!bnr.ca!harp@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <25lpek$kct@chnews.intel.com>, <joer.746497518@zen.DEV.3Com.COM>,
<CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>
Subject : Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu> jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff
Herman) writes:
>

>
>The CW operators are true gentlemen. I dare any of you to listen to
>the CW segments and prove me wrong (of course, that will take a knowledge
>of code...)
>
>In the 25 years that I have been reading QST I don't recall the FCC ever
>taking action against a ham operating CW. Never.
>
>Jeff NH6IL
>
>
>
>
>
I hate to tell you this but I am keenly aware of an incident where a
extra class ham was fined heavily for running too much power in the
novice band.

Complaints were filed by one of his neighbors, another ham. He alledged
that the guy was QRMing him on 20 meters with his second harmonic by
operating in the novice band on 40 meters.

The FCC came and monitored the situation and didn't try to prove the
interference charge, but did make power measurements and cited him.

These two people had a heavy feud going.

I'm sorry to admit that we are not all gentlemen all the time.

I do feel that the atmosphere is much better in the CW bands and
the percentage of LIDs is much lower there.

I've been licensed for more than 30 years now. I used to operate SSB
and run phone patches. I got tired of all the crap. I only get on SSB
when I have to talk to someone.

I have pretty much abandoned the phone band altogether. All I can say
is the last one out bring the flag!

****
* Alan Harp K4PB   *   Bell-Northern Research   *   CW FOREVER   *
* mail: harp@bnr.ca *   Research Triangle Park, NC   *   *
****

Date: 30 Aug 93 19:42:42 GMT
From: ogicse!uwm.edu!cs.utexas.edu!asuvax!chnews!news@network.ucsd.edu

To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <joer.746497518@zen.DEV.3Com.COM>, <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>,
<harp.18.0@bnr.ca>p
Subject : Re: I WANT, I WANT, I WANT, I WANT Wah Wah Wah

In article <harp.18.0@bnr.ca> harp@bnr.ca (Alan Harp, K4PB) writes:
>In article <CCG8H1.IGJ@news.Hawaii.Edu>
>   jherman@uhunix3.uhcc.Hawaii.Edu (Jeff Herman) writes:

>>The CW operators are true gentlemen. I dare any of you to listen to
>>the CW segments and prove me wrong (of course, that will take a knowledge
>>of code...)

>I hate to tell you this but I am keenly aware of an incident where a
>extra class ham was fined heavily for running too much power in the
>novice band...

Another, more common, example of when it gets down and dirty is when
rare DX shows up on 20-meter CW and a pileup ensues. Not only does
everyone's QSO within 20 kHz of the DX get clobbered, the melee
sometimes ends with someone intentionally transmitting "LID LID
LID..." right on top of the DX station. One doesn't have to be able
to copy code well to get the gist of this!

>I'm sorry to admit that we are not all gentlemen all the time.

Yes, and your shit stinks just like everyone else's. So what? ;-)

>I do feel that the atmosphere is much better in the CW bands and
>the percentage of LIDs is much lower there.

That is my perception too. And the few times I have ventured down on
40 meters with my 5 wpm fist, I have gotten a lot of support,
encouragement and patience from everyone I contacted. Definitely
different from the way it would have gone in the same situation on
'phone or VHF-FM.

Jim, W5GYJ

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #314
****